

Issue No.	Statement of Issue	Petitioners' Proposed Contract Language	Petitioners' Rationale	Verizon's Proposed Contract Language	Verizon Rationale
I-5-a	<p><u>(a) What provisions should the parties make for changes in the requirements of the ISP Order through appeal, reconsideration or other legal or regulatory action?</u></p> <p><i>How should Verizon and AT&T calculate whether traffic exceeds a 3:1 ratio of terminating to originating traffic?</i></p>	<p><u>5.7.7.1 Scope</u></p> <p>• • •</p> <p><u>(c) Upon the occurrence of any one of the following conditions: (1) the ISP Order is not allowed to go into effect or is stayed after its effective date; (2) the ISP Order is revised or reversed by a court of competent jurisdiction; or (3) the ISP Order is affected by any legislative or other legal action; the Parties reserve all of their rights and remedies, including those to amend, alter, or revise this Agreement.</u></p> <p><i>See AT&T contract language for I-5.</i></p>	<p><u>POSITION:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>The Agreement must include specific provisions regarding the parties' rights in the event the ISP Order is stayed, reversed or otherwise affected by legislative, regulatory or legal action. Collins Direct Testimony at 21-22.</u> <p><u>DISPUTED ISSUES OF FACT:</u></p> <p><u>All facts asserted in Cox's Petition and in the Direct and Rebuttal Testimony of Cox's witness, Dr. Francis Collins, that are not listed below as admissions are deemed by Cox to be disputed.</u></p> <p><u>ADMISSIONS PURSUANT TO ARBITRATION PROCEDURES NOTICE:</u></p> <p><u>Pursuant to the Arbitration Procedures Notice, Procedures Established for Arbitration of Interconnection Agreements Between Verizon and AT&T, Cox, and WorldCom, Public Notice, DA 01-270 (rel. Feb. 1, 2001), the following assertions made in Cox's Petition or in the Direct Testimony of Cox's witness, Dr. Collins, and not specifically denied in Verizon's Answer or in the testimony of Verizon's witnesses are deemed admitted:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>The issue of compensation for ISP-bound traffic has been remanded to the Commission by the courts on one occasion.</u> <p><i>See AT&T rationale for I-5.</i></p>	<p>See Verizon contract language for I-5.</p>	<p>See Verizon contract language for I-5.</p> <p>Verizon has neither stipulated to nor admitted the factual allegations set forth by Cox under the heading "Admissions Pursuant to Arbitration Procedures Notice."</p>

KEY WHERE DISTINCTION AMONG PETITIONERS IS NECESSARY: WorldCom (bold); Cox (underline text); AT&T (italic).

Issue No.	Statement of Issue	Petitioners' Proposed Contract Language	Petitioners' Rationale	Verizon's Proposed Contract Language	Verizon Rationale
I-5-b	<p>(b) <u>Should the specific rates of compensation for ISP-bound traffic paid by the parties during the term of the renewal agreement be zero, a rate equal to the cap or a rate somewhere in between zero and the cap?</u></p> <p><i>How should Verizon and AT&T implement the rate caps for the ISP-bound traffic?</i></p>	<p><u>5.7.7.2 Rates</u></p> <p>(a) <u>For the Term of this Agreement, Reciprocal Compensation rates shown in Exhibit 1 will apply to the exchange of all 251(b)5 traffic.</u></p> <p>(b) <u>For the period beginning on June 14, 2001 and ending on December 13, 2001, the terminating Party will bill the originating Party a rate of \$.0015 per minute of use (MOU) for Internet Traffic delivered to the terminating Party's Tandem and/or End Office.</u></p> <p>(c) <u>To the extent that this Agreement remains in effect, beginning on December 14, 2001, and ending on June 13, 2003, the terminating Party will bill the originating Party a rate of \$.0010 per MOU for Internet Traffic delivered to the terminating Party's Tandem and/or End Office.</u></p> <p>(d) <u>To the extent that this Agreement remains in effect, beginning on June 14, 2003, and ending on June 13, 2004, the terminating Party will bill the originating Party a rate of \$.0007 per MOU for Internet Traffic delivered to the terminating Party's Tandem and/or End</u></p>	<p><u>POSITION:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Specific terms and conditions regarding the compensation rates applicable to Internet Traffic must not be excluded from the Agreement. Collins Testimony at 22.</u> • <u>The Agreement must contain the specific rates applicable to compensation for ISP-bound traffic (and their timeframes). Collins Testimony at 22.</u> <p><u>DISPUTED ISSUES OF FACT:</u></p> <p><u>All facts asserted in Cox's Petition and in the Direct and Rebuttal Testimony of Cox's witness, Dr. Francis Collins, that are not listed below as admissions are deemed by Cox to be disputed.</u></p> <p><u>ADMISSIONS PURSUANT TO ARBITRATION PROCEDURES NOTICE:</u></p> <p><u>Pursuant to the <i>Arbitration Procedures Notice, Procedures Established for Arbitration of Interconnection Agreements Between Verizon and AT&T, Cox, and WorldCom, Public Notice, DA 01-270</i> (rel. Feb. 1, 2001), the following assertions made in Cox's Petition or in the Direct Testimony of Cox's witness, Dr. Collins, and not specifically denied in Verizon's Answer or in the testimony of Verizon's witnesses are deemed admitted:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>The actual rate that the Parties will pay for exchanging ISP-bound traffic is not established by the <i>ISP-Bound Traffic Order</i>.</u> • <u>The <i>ISP-Bound Traffic Order</i> merely sets caps on the</u> 	<p>See Verizon contract language for I-5.</p>	<p>See Verizon contract language for I-5.</p> <p>Verizon has neither stipulated to nor admitted the factual allegations set forth by Cox under the heading "Admissions Pursuant to Arbitration Procedures Notice."</p>

KEY WHERE DISTINCTION AMONG PETITIONERS IS NECESSARY: **WorldCom** (bold); Cox (underline text); *AT&T* (italic).

Issue No.	Statement of Issue	Petitioners' Proposed Contract Language	Petitioners' Rationale	Verizon's Proposed Contract Language	Verizon Rationale
		<p><u>Office.</u></p> <p>(e) <u>The ISP Order specifies that, in the event the FCC does not take further action within the final period during which the \$.0007 per MOU rate cap will be applicable to Internet Traffic, that period will be extended until the FCC takes such further action. The Parties agree that the \$.0007 per MOU rate for tandem-routed and/or End Office-routed traffic will continue in effect for Internet Traffic beyond June 13, 2004, if the FCC fails to take such further action by that date, to the extent this Agreement remains in effect during such period.</u></p> <p>-----</p> <p><u>Add footnotes to Exhibit A, A(I) and B(I): "See Section 5.7.7 regarding compensation for Internet Traffic."</u></p> <p><i>See AT&T contract language for I-5.</i></p>	<p><u>rates that can be charged for handling ISP-bound traffic, leaving to the Parties the question of what specific rates will apply.</u></p> <p>• <u>The Parties are required to either fix an actual rate to be charged for handling ISP-bound traffic through negotiation or arbitrate the issue.</u></p> <p><i>See AT&T rationale for I-5.</i></p>		
I-5-c	<p>(c) <u>What mechanism should be used by the parties in calculating the amount of traffic in excess of the 3:1 ratio; what data should be exchanged by the parties for use in making this calculation; what time periods should these data cover; and when should any such data exchange take place?</u></p> <p><i>How should Verizon and AT&T</i></p>	<p><u>5.7.7.3 Ratio</u></p> <p>(a) <u>The FCC has adopted a rebuttable presumption that traffic delivered to a carrier that exceeds a 3:1 ratio of terminating to originating traffic is Internet Traffic. Therefore, the combined Internet Traffic and section 251(b)(5) traffic shall be</u></p>	<p><u>POSITION:</u></p> <p>• <u>The Agreement must ultimately contain the specific mechanism used by the parties for calculating the 3:1 ratio to identify ISP-bound traffic, including the types of data exchanged and the timeframes for such exchange. Collins Direct Testimony at 22.</u></p> <p>• <u>To the extent the specific mechanisms and timeframes for calculating the 3:1 ratio are not yet developed by the parties, principles to guide their development must be</u></p>	See Verizon contract language for I-5.	See Verizon contract language for I-5.

KEY WHERE DISTINCTION AMONG PETITIONERS IS NECESSARY: **WorldCom** (bold); Cox (underline text); *AT&T* (italic).

Issue No.	Statement of Issue	Petitioners' Proposed Contract Language	Petitioners' Rationale	Verizon's Proposed Contract Language	Verizon Rationale
	calculate the growth cap on the total number of compensable ISP-bound traffic minutes?	separated by applying a ratio factor of 3:1 until such time as either Party successfully rebuts this presumption in a proceeding conducted by a regulatory authority or court of competent jurisdiction. In the event that such a proceeding is instituted, the Parties may exercise their discovery rights pursuant to the Commission's procedures. All such traffic exchanged between the Parties up to a 3:1 ratio of terminating to originating traffic shall be deemed to be section 251(b)(5) traffic subject to the Reciprocal Compensation rates shown in Exhibit 1. Except as may be modified by subsection 5.7.7.4 below, the remainder of such traffic, i.e., all minutes exceeding the 3:1 ratio of terminating to originating traffic, shall be deemed to be Internet Traffic subject to the rates established in subsection 5.7.7.2 above. In the event that a regulatory authority or court of competent jurisdiction enters a final order establishing a different ratio factor for the separation of Internet Traffic and section 251(b)(5) traffic that is applicable to this Agreement, the Parties agree that such different ratio factor shall be substituted for the 3:1 ratio factor for purposes of implementing this section. Unless	<p>included in the Agreement. Collins Direct Testimony at 22.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Parties had agreed to a provision that granted both the right to two audits per year. However, Verizon now proposes that it – and only it – should have the right to conduct unlimited audits to determine whether Cox is billing reciprocal compensation traffic properly. Such a provision is not needed in view of the agreed-to provision. Collins Rebuttal Testimony at 29. • Additionally, Verizon's audit right proposal is wrongfully biased in Verizon's favor since it would grant Verizon unilateral power that is unavailable to Cox. Collins Rebuttal Testimony at 30. • While alleging that it needs this unilateral audit right to determine the accuracy of Cox's bills, Verizon has failed to work with Cox to develop a mechanism to identify the traffic to be billed as reciprocal compensation. Collins Rebuttal Testimony at 30-31. <p><u>DISPUTED ISSUES OF FACT:</u></p> <p>All facts asserted in Cox's Petition and in the Direct and Rebuttal Testimony of Cox's witness, Dr. Francis Collins, that are not listed below as admissions are deemed by Cox to be disputed.</p> <p><u>ADMISSIONS PURSUANT TO ARBITRATION PROCEDURES NOTICE:</u></p> <p>Pursuant to the <i>Arbitration Procedures Notice</i>, Procedures Established for Arbitration of Interconnection Agreements Between Verizon and AT&T, Cox, and WorldCom, <i>Public Notice</i>, DA 01-270</p>		Verizon has neither stipulated to nor admitted the factual allegations set forth by Cox under the heading "Admissions Pursuant to Arbitration Procedures Notice."

KEY WHERE DISTINCTION AMONG PETITIONERS IS NECESSARY: **WorldCom** (bold); Cox (underline text); *AT&T* (italic).

Issue No.	Statement of Issue	Petitioners' Proposed Contract Language	Petitioners' Rationale	Verizon's Proposed Contract Language	Verizon Rationale
		<p><u>such final order specifies a different effective date for the different ratio factor, such substitution should become effective on the effective date of such final order.</u></p> <p><u>(b) In order that the Parties may calculate the balance of Local and Internet Traffic exchanged, the Parties agree to establish and implement a separate process ("Internet Ratio Calculation & Billing Process"), which shall be incorporated into this Agreement by amendment no later than 90 days following the Effective Date of this Agreement. The Parties agree that the following principles will govern the Internet Ratio Calculation & Billing Process: (i) Verizon and Cox shall, at an agreed-to interval following the end of the Parties' billing cycle(s), exchange billing summaries that include the total minutes of combined Local and Internet Traffic received from the other Party and accumulated during an agreed-to period of time; (ii) the billing summary shall include the cumulative minutes of use associated with every call in which the calling and called party's NPA-NXX (or LNP-equivalent identifier) are located within the local calling area and any mandatory expanded area</u></p>	<p><u>(rel. Feb. 1, 2001), the following assertions made in Cox's Petition or in the Direct Testimony of Cox's witness, Dr. Collins, and not specifically denied in Verizon's Answer or in the testimony of Verizon's witnesses are deemed admitted:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>• The ISP-Bound Traffic Order adopts a 3:1 ratio for differentiating between ISP-bound traffic and other traffic.</u> <u>• The ISP-Bound Traffic Order does not adopt a mechanism for parties' use in applying the 3:1 ratio.</u> <u>• A mechanism for parties' use in applying the 3:1 ratio involves the practices under which parties bill each other, and these practices vary by party.</u> <p><i>See AT&T rationale for I-5.</i></p>		

KEY WHERE DISTINCTION AMONG PETITIONERS IS NECESSARY: **WorldCom** (bold); Cox (underline text); *AT&T* (italic).

Issue No.	Statement of Issue	Petitioners' Proposed Contract Language	Petitioners' Rationale	Verizon's Proposed Contract Language	Verizon Rationale
		<p>service, as defined by Verizon's tariffs; (iii) following each Party's calculation of the ratio, the Parties shall bill one another for their exchange of Local Traffic in accordance Section 5.7.1, and Cox will bill Verizon for its delivery of Internet Traffic according to this Section 5.7.7; and (iv) the Parties agree to make the Internet Ratio Calculation & Billing Process retroactive to the Effective Date of this Agreement.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>[Cox proposes to delete Verizon's proposed paragraph 5.7.8.]</p> <p><i>See AT&T contract language for I-5.</i></p>			
I-5-d	<p>(d) <u>Should specific terms be adopted to govern the implementation of the growth caps on compensable ISP-bound traffic, incorporating an actual number based on the parties' traffic for the first quarter of 2001, and should that cap be applied on an annual basis?</u></p> <p><i>How should the parties implement a Verizon offer to exchange all traffic subject to section 251(b)(5) at the rate mandated by the FCC for terminating ISP-bound traffic?</i></p>	<p><u>5.7.7.4 Cap on Total Internet Traffic Minutes</u></p> <p>(a) For Internet Traffic exchanged during the year 2001, and to the extent this Agreement remains in effect during that year, compensation at the rates set out above shall be billed by the terminating Party to the originating Party on Internet Traffic minutes only up to a ceiling equal to, on an annualized basis, the number of Internet Traffic minutes for which the terminating Party was entitled to</p>	<p><u>POSITION:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Specific terms and conditions regarding the growth caps applicable to ISP-bound traffic must not be excluded from the Agreement. Collins Direct Testimony at 22-23. • The Agreement must contain specific terms regarding implementation of the growth caps on compensable ISP-bound traffic, including the actual baseline cap applicable to 2001. Collins Direct Testimony at 22-23. <p><u>DISPUTED ISSUES OF FACT:</u></p> <p>All facts asserted in Cox's Petition and in the Direct and Rebuttal Testimony of Cox's witness, Dr. Francis</p>	See Verizon contract language for I-5.	See Verizon contract language for I-5.

KEY WHERE DISTINCTION AMONG PETITIONERS IS NECESSARY: **WorldCom** (bold); Cox (underline text); *AT&T* (italic).

Issue No.	Statement of Issue	Petitioners' Proposed Contract Language	Petitioners' Rationale	Verizon's Proposed Contract Language	Verizon Rationale
		<p>compensation during the first quarter of 2001, plus a ten percent growth factor. The Parties agree that the number of Internet Traffic minutes for which the terminating Party was entitled to compensation during the first quarter of 2001 is _____. Therefore, the cap for total Internet Traffic minutes for 2001, expressed on an annualized basis, is _____, which is calculated by multiplying the first quarter total by four and increasing the result by ten percent.</p> <p>(b) For Internet Traffic exchanged during the year 2002 and to the extent this Agreement remains in effect during that year, compensation at the rates set out above shall be billed by the terminating Party to the originating Party on Internet Traffic minutes only up to a ceiling equal to the number of Internet Traffic minutes for which the terminating Party was entitled to compensation in 2001, plus a ten percent growth factor. The Parties agree that the cap for total Internet Traffic minutes number of Internet Traffic minutes for which the terminating Party is entitled to compensation in 2002 is _____, which is calculated by increasing the cap</p>	<p>Collins, that are not listed below as admissions are deemed by Cox to be disputed.</p> <p><u>ADMISSIONS PURSUANT TO ARBITRATION PROCEDURES NOTICE:</u></p> <p>Pursuant to the <i>Arbitration Procedures Notice, Procedures Established for Arbitration of Interconnection Agreements Between Verizon and AT&T, Cox, and WorldCom, Public Notice, DA 01-270</i> (rel. Feb. 1, 2001), the following assertions made in Cox's Petition or in the Direct Testimony of Cox's witness, Dr. Collins, and not specifically denied in Verizon's Answer or in the testimony of Verizon's witnesses are deemed admitted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The actual baseline cap for 2001 can be calculated based on the traffic already exchanged by the parties during the first quarter of 2001. • The only action required for establishing the actual baseline cap for 2001 is for Cox and Verizon simply to compare their respective traffic information and reach agreement on that number. • If the establishment of the actual baseline cap for 2001 is deferred until some later date, the requisite data will no longer be fresh. <p>See AT&T rationale for I-5.</p>		<p>Verizon has neither stipulated to nor admitted the factual allegations set forth by Cox under the heading "Admissions Pursuant to Arbitration Procedures Notice."</p>

KEY WHERE DISTINCTION AMONG PETITIONERS IS NECESSARY: **WorldCom** (bold); Cox (underline text); *AT&T* (italic).

Issue No.	Statement of Issue	Petitioners' Proposed Contract Language	Petitioners' Rationale	Verizon's Proposed Contract Language	Verizon Rationale
		<p><u>for total Internet Traffic minutes for 2001 by ten percent.</u></p> <p><u>(c) For Internet Traffic exchanged during the year 2003 and to the extent this Agreement remains in effect during that year, compensation at the rates set out above shall be billed by the terminating Party to the originating Party only on Internet Traffic minutes up to the year 2002 cap determined in subsection 5.7.7.4(b) above.</u></p> <p><u>(d) The cap will be applied on an annual basis. The terminating Party shall bill the originating Party monthly for all Internet Traffic received until the annual cap is reached, at which point, the terminating Party will cease further billing of Internet Traffic for the remainder of that calendar year.</u></p> <p><u>(e) The minutes of Internet Traffic that exceed the ceiling established for each year shall be exchanged by the Parties on a bill and keep basis, without compensation being paid on such excess minutes by either Party.</u></p> <p><i>See AT&T contract language for I-5.</i></p>			

KEY WHERE DISTINCTION AMONG PETITIONERS IS NECESSARY: **WorldCom** (bold); Cox (underline text); *AT&T* (italic).

Issue No.	Statement of Issue	Petitioners' Proposed Contract Language	Petitioners' Rationale	Verizon's Proposed Contract Language	Verizon Rationale
I-5-e	<p><u>(e) What definitions are needed to implement the ISP Order?</u></p> <p><i>What mechanism should the parties utilize to implement, in an expeditious fashion, changes resulting from any successful legal appeals of the Commission's ISP Remand Order?</i></p>	<p><u>1.0 Definitions:</u></p> <p><u>1.36 "Internet Traffic" shall have the same meaning, when used in this Agreement, as the term "ISP-bound traffic" is used in the FCC's Order on Remand and Report and Order in CC Docket Nos. 96-98 & 99-68, FCC 01-131, released April 27, 2001. Generally speaking, "Internet Traffic" refers to telecommunications traffic delivered to Internet service providers.</u></p> <p>-----</p> <p><u>1.39 "Local Traffic" means traffic that is originated by a Customer of one Party on that Party's network and terminates to a Customer of the other Party on that other Party's network, within a given local calling area, or mandatory expanded area service ("EAS") area (based on the rate center point of the originating and terminating NPA-NXXs of the callers), as defined in Verizon's effective Customer tariffs, or, if the Commission has defined local calling areas applicable to all LECs, then as so defined by the Commission. Local Traffic does not include any Internet Traffic (as such term is hereinafter defined). Generally speaking, the term "Local Traffic" shall have</u></p>	<p><u>POSITION:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>The Agreement must contain specific definitions for implementing the FCC's ISP Order to prevent inconsistency and to promote clarity. Collins Direct Testimony at 23.</u> • <u>To ensure understanding and add clarity, the definition for "Internet Traffic" should incorporate reference to the ISP Order as well as the FCC's use of "ISP-bound traffic." Collins Direct Testimony at 23; Collins Rebuttal Testimony at 24-29.</u> • <u>To ensure understanding and add clarity, the definition for "Local Traffic" should incorporate reference to the ISP Order as well as the FCC's use of "251(b)(5) traffic." Cox Amended Petition at 15-6.</u> • <u>To ensure understanding and add clarity, the definition for "Local Traffic" should incorporate reference to Verizon's mandatory local calling areas. Cox Amended Petition at 15-6.</u> • <u>To ensure understanding and add clarity, the definition of PLU should include instruction as to its relationship to other jurisdictional factors applied to minutes of use. Cox Amended Petition at 15-6.</u> • <u>Verizon proposes a definition of "Internet Traffic" and a usage of that term in the Agreement that depart widely from the Commission's usage of the term "ISP-bound traffic" in the ISP-Bound Traffic Order. Collins Direct Testimony at 23; Collins Rebuttal Testimony at 24-29.</u> • <u>Cox interprets the FCC's August 17th letter as</u> 	See Verizon contract language for I-5.	See Verizon rationale for I-5.

KEY WHERE DISTINCTION AMONG PETITIONERS IS NECESSARY: **WorldCom** (bold); Cox (underline text); *AT&T* (italic).

Issue No.	Statement of Issue	Petitioners' Proposed Contract Language	Petitioners' Rationale	Verizon's Proposed Contract Language	Verizon Rationale
		<p>the same meaning, when used in this Agreement, as the term "251(b)(5) traffic" is used in the FCC's Order on Remand and Report and Order in CC Docket Nos. 96-98 & 99-68, FCC 01-131, released April 27, 2001.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>1.51 "Percent Interstate Usage" or "PIU" is a factor that distinguishes the interstate portion of minutes from the intrastate portion of minutes of traffic exchanged via Traffic Exchange Trunks. PIU is a whole number developed through consideration of every call in which the calling and called party are not located within the LATA. PIU is the first such factor applied to traffic for jurisdictional separation of traffic.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>1.52 "Percent Local Usage" or "PLU" is a factor that distinguishes the intraLATA, intrastate portion of minutes from the interLATA, intrastate portion of minutes of traffic exchanged via Traffic Exchange Trunks. PLU is a whole number developed through consideration of every call in which the calling and called party are located within the same Rate Center Area. The PLU factor is applied to traffic only after the PIU factor has been applied for jurisdictional</p>	<p>requiring Verizon to modify its proposed language by substituting the term "Measured Internet Traffic" for the term "Internet Traffic" throughout the Agreement, except in the definitions of the terms "Internet Traffic" and "Measured Internet Traffic." The letter issued by the FCC, dated August 17, 2001.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the definition and usage of the term "Internet Traffic" proposed by Verizon were adopted, it would affect the settled aspects of the Agreement in myriad ways – none of which is linked to implementation of the <i>ISP-Bound Traffic Order</i>. Collins Direct Testimony at 23; Collins Rebuttal Testimony at 25-26. • The Parties had agreed to a usage of the original term "Internet Traffic;" however, Verizon's proposal revision of that definition would change a host of other provisions that previously were agreed to by the Parties, and would have significant effects on how Cox and Verizon interconnect. Collins Rebuttal Testimony at 26. • The revision described above suggests that a Party may withhold reciprocal compensation for traffic that is handled using phone-to-phone IP telephony. Collins Rebuttal Testimony at 26. • Since Verizon proposes that reciprocal compensation not be paid for traffic meeting its proposed definition of "Internet Traffic," such compensation would be excluded for traffic that is not subject to the <i>ISP-Bound Traffic Order</i>. Collins Rebuttal Testimony at 27. • The meaning of several other sections of the Agreement for which the Parties have already agreed to language would be altered by Verizon's proposed revision of the definition of "Internet Traffic." Collins 		

KEY WHERE DISTINCTION AMONG PETITIONERS IS NECESSARY: **WorldCom** (bold); Cox (underline text); *AT&T* (italic).

Issue No.	Statement of Issue	Petitioners' Proposed Contract Language	Petitioners' Rationale	Verizon's Proposed Contract Language	Verizon Rationale
		<p><u>separation of traffic. The PLU factor is applied to traffic before a ratio is applied to identify Internet Traffic minutes.</u></p> <p>-----</p> <p>Modify various instances of "Local Traffic" by adding "Internet Traffic" in the following subsections: 1.7.1; 4.4.3; 5.6.1.1; 5.6.1.2; 5.6.2; 17.1.2; Sched. 4.2 (1) and (5).</p> <p><i>See AT&T contract language for I-5.</i></p>	<p>Rebuttal Testimony at 27-29.</p> <p><u>DISPUTED ISSUES OF FACT:</u></p> <p>All facts asserted in Cox's Petition and in the Direct and Rebuttal Testimony of Cox's witness, Dr. Francis Collins, that are not listed below as admissions are deemed by Cox to be disputed.</p> <p><u>ADMISSIONS PURSUANT TO ARBITRATION PROCEDURES NOTICE:</u></p> <p>Pursuant to the <i>Arbitration Procedures Notice, Procedures Established for Arbitration of Interconnection Agreements Between Verizon and AT&T, Cox, and WorldCom, Public Notice</i>, DA 01-270 (rel. Feb. 1, 2001), the following assertions made in Cox's Petition or in the Direct Testimony of Cox's witness, Dr. Collins, and not specifically denied in Verizon's Answer or in the testimony of Verizon's witnesses are deemed admitted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The definition of "Internet Traffic" and the usage of that term in the Agreement proposed by Verizon differ from the Commission's definition of "ISP-bound traffic" and usage of that term in the <i>ISP-Bound Traffic Order</i>. <p><i>See AT&T rationale for I-5.</i></p>		<p>Verizon has neither stipulated to nor admitted the factual allegations set forth by Cox under the heading "Admissions Pursuant to Arbitration Procedures Notice."</p>
I-6	<p>Is the jurisdiction of a call determined by the NPA-NXXs of the calling and called numbers?</p> <p><u>Verizon may not impose infeasible methods for determining toll versus local traffic.</u></p>	<p>Attachment I, Section 4.2.1.2:</p> <p>4.2.1.2 The provisions of this Section [4.2] apply to reciprocal compensation for transport and termination of Local Traffic. Local Traffic is traffic originated by one Party and directed to the NPA-NXX-</p>	<p>This issue involves the proper jurisdictional designation of FX traffic. As discussed below, WorldCom's FX traffic is local traffic just like Verizon's FX traffic. Moreover, the standard industry practice has always been that FX traffic is local traffic. Therefore, reciprocal compensation is applicable to FX calls.</p> <p>Verizon's proposal to rate WorldCom's FX service</p>	<p>WorldCom: See Glossary § 2.58 above; Interconnection Attachment § 7</p> <p><u>5.7.1 . . . The designation of traffic as Local Traffic for purposes of Reciprocal Compensation shall be based on the originating and terminating</u></p>	<p>The CLECs advocate a practice of arbitrage in the number assignment system that disassociates the cost of providing FX service (loaded entirely on Verizon) from the revenues the service generates (available only to the CLECs). The location of the caller, not the telephone</p>

KEY WHERE DISTINCTION AMONG PETITIONERS IS NECESSARY: WorldCom (bold); Cox (underline text); AT&T (italic).

Issue No.	Statement of Issue	Petitioners' Proposed Contract Language	Petitioners' Rationale	Verizon's Proposed Contract Language	Verizon Rationale
		<p>XXXX of a LERG-registered end office of the other Party within a Local Calling Area and any extended service area, as defined by the Commission.</p> <p><u>5.7.1The designation of traffic as Local Traffic for purposes of Reciprocal Compensation shall be based on the originating and terminating NPA-NXXs of the complete end-to-end communication.</u></p> <p><u>5.7.4 The designation of traffic as Local or IntraLATA Toll for purposes of compensation shall be based on the horizontal and vertical coordinates associated with the originating and terminating NPA-NXXs of the call, regardless of the carrier(s) involved in carrying any segment of the call.</u></p>	<p>as a toll service will insulate Verizon's own FX service from competition.</p> <p>Section 251(b)(5) of the 1996 Act requires parties to include in their interconnection agreements "reciprocal compensation arrangements for the transport and termination of telecommunications." 47 U.S.C. § 251(b)(5); <u>see also</u> 47 U.S.C. § 251(d)(2). Under the FCC's regulations interpreting section 251(b)(5), reciprocal compensation is to be paid for "local telecommunications traffic." 47 C.F.R. § 51.701(a) (emphasis added). The determination of what is a local call has traditionally been based upon the NPA-NXXs of the calling and called numbers. As discussed below, incumbent local exchange carriers have traditionally offered foreign exchange (FX) service which effectively extends the local calling area of subscribers. (Grieco/Ball Direct, 7/31, at 49-50).</p> <p>This issue involves the question of whether a CLEC has the right to assign NPA/NXX codes to end users located outside the rate center in which the NPA/NXX is homed such that it can compete with ILEC FX offerings. Verizon and CLECs disagree concerning whether a CLEC terminating such FX traffic should receive reciprocal compensation from the originating carrier.</p> <p>WorldCom's position is that Verizon is required by the Act and FCC Rules to pay reciprocal compensation for the termination of local calls, including local calls made to NPA/NXXs that the CLEC may have assigned to non-ISP customers who may be physically located outside the rate center to which the NPA/NXX is homed. (Id. At 50).</p> <p>The obligation to pay reciprocal compensation on</p>	<p><u>points of the complete end-to-end communication.</u></p> <p><u>1.39 "Local Traffic" means traffic that is originated by a Customer of one Party on that Party's network and terminates to a Customer of the other Party on that other Party's network within a given local calling area, or expanded area service ("EAS") area, as defined in Verizon's effective Customer Tariffs. Local Traffic does not include Internet Traffic.</u></p>	<p>number that a LEC chooses to assign to its customer, should determine whether a call is interexchange traffic or local exchange traffic.</p> <p><u>See</u> Direct Testimony of Steven J. Pitterle and Pete D'Amico, dated July 31, 2001, at pp. 5-13; and Rebuttal Testimony of Steven J. Pitterle and Pete D'Amico, dated August 17, 2001, at pp. 9-17.</p>

KEY WHERE DISTINCTION AMONG PETITIONERS IS NECESSARY: WorldCom (bold); Cox (underline text); AT&T (italic).

Issue No.	Statement of Issue	Petitioners' Proposed Contract Language	Petitioners' Rationale	Verizon's Proposed Contract Language	Verizon Rationale
			<p>these FX calls may be limited to non-ISP customers as defined by the FCC in its recent order. (ISP Remand Order). The FCC has established an interim compensation mechanism for such ISP calls. <i>See id</i> at ¶ 3-8. The issue of a permanent compensation mechanism for such ISP-bound traffic will be considered as part of the rulemaking the FCC initiated on April 27, 2001 regarding development of a unified intercarrier compensation regime. <i>See</i> Intercarrier Compensation NPRM. Thus, the amount of traffic affected by this FX issue may have been narrowed by the FCC's recent ruling regarding ISP-bound traffic.</p> <p>This FX issue is important because (a) CLECs should be permitted to offer competitive FX service by assigning NPA/NXXs to end users who may be physically located outside the rate center in which the NPA/NXX is homed, and (b) CLECs are entitled to receive reciprocal compensation for local calls originated by Verizon and terminated to such (non-ISP) end users. (<i>Id.</i> At 51).</p> <p>Verizon's position is that when its customer calls a CLECs customer which has a telephone number that is within the local calling area of the Verizon customer, but where the CLEC customer is physically located outside of the rate center, the call should be treated as though it were an interexchange call. Verizon's position is that the jurisdiction of the call is based on the physical location of the parties, not the NPA-NXX of the called and calling parties. (<i>Id.</i> At 51-52).</p> <p>Foreign Exchange ("FX") Service is a telecommunications service that has been available for years and is simply a response to customer demand for dial tone in an exchange separate from</p>		

KEY WHERE DISTINCTION AMONG PETITIONERS IS NECESSARY: **WorldCom** (bold); Cox (underline text); *AT&T* (italic).

Issue No.	Statement of Issue	Petitioners' Proposed Contract Language	Petitioners' Rationale	Verizon's Proposed Contract Language	Verizon Rationale
			<p>the customer's physical location.</p> <p>CLECs can provide FX service, as Verizon does, by assigning an NPA/NXX in the desired exchange to a customer who is physically located outside the rate center in which the NPA/NXX is homed. (Id. At 52).</p> <p>The CLECs' offering of FX service provides a competitive alternative to Verizon's FX service. (Id.).</p> <p>Treatment of FX traffic as "local" is consistent with industry precedent and practice. (Id.)</p> <p>Failure to treat CLEC-provided FX as local, consistent with the local treatment of Verizon's FX service, will eliminate competition for FX service. (Id.)</p> <p>FX service involves providing service to a customer physically located outside the rate center to which his or her NPA/NXX is assigned. For example, if a CLEC customer in the Engleside exchange is assigned an NPA/NXX from the Leesburg rate center, that customer is receiving a foreign exchange service. Customers located in Leesburg may call the CLEC customer's foreign exchange number and that call will be treated as a local call. This example also holds true if Verizon assigns the Leesburg NPA/NXX to the Engleside customer. (Id. At 53)</p> <p>Generally, users of FX service want to establish a local business presence in an area beyond their physical location. And, because being able to be reached via a local telephone call is an integral part of a business' "presence," this typically corresponds with that FX subscriber's desire to serve its customers that are located beyond the local calling area where the business is located. For example, a floral shop located in the Engleside exchange may</p>		

KEY WHERE DISTINCTION AMONG PETITIONERS IS NECESSARY: **WorldCom** (bold); Cox (underline text); *AT&T* (italic).

Issue No.	Statement of Issue	Petitioners' Proposed Contract Language	Petitioners' Rationale	Verizon's Proposed Contract Language	Verizon Rationale
			<p>desire a local presence in Leesburg. Moreover, customers in Leesburg are more likely to call a florist with a local Leesburg telephone number, not just because it is a local call, but also because there may be an expectation on the part of the caller that a "local" florist would best be able to fulfill the need for a delivery of flowers in Leesburg.</p> <p>Given this demand for FX service, it is not surprising that the market has responded. Both CLECs and ILECs have made FX service offerings available and actively compete for customers for FX service. Of course ILECs, as the monopoly local providers, were "first" to offer FX service. Verizon, like other ILECs, offers FX service. (Id. At 53).</p> <p>Just as with the CLECs' FX offerings, when Verizon provides retail FX service, NPA/NXXs are assigned to end users located outside the local calling area of the rate center with which the NPA/NXX has been associated, and the jurisdiction (i.e., local vs. toll) of traffic delivered from the foreign exchange to the end user is determined as if the end user were physically located in the foreign exchange. Simply, the jurisdiction of the call is determined by comparing the called and calling party's NPA/NXXs, not the physical location of the customers. (Id. At 54).</p> <p>Despite the traditional treatment of FX service, Verizon has now proposed to classify CLECs' FX services as toll service.</p> <p>Verizon proposes that the traditional method of determining the jurisdiction of calls by comparing the NPA-NXXs of the calling and called parties be replaced with an unspecified method involving the comparison of the physical locations of the calling and called party. If Verizon's approach were adopted, Verizon would intend to bill switched access</p>		

KEY WHERE DISTINCTION AMONG PETITIONERS IS NECESSARY: WorldCom (bold); Cox (underline text); AT&T (italic).

Issue No.	Statement of Issue	Petitioners' Proposed Contract Language	Petitioners' Rationale	Verizon's Proposed Contract Language	Verizon Rationale
			<p>charges on calls that, from the calling party's perspective, are local. The ultimate outcome Verizon is seeking is to insulate their Foreign Exchange (FX) service from competitive offerings by CLECs. (Grieco/Ball Rebuttal, 8/17, at 24).</p> <p>Verizon boldly makes the unsubstantiated claim that "The <u>physical locations</u> of the caller and the called party must be used to determine whether a call is eligible for reciprocal compensation under § 251(b)(5) of the Act." This is simply not true. Such a requirement is not to be found in the current interconnection agreement, in existing FCC Orders, or in the Telecommunications Act of 1996. What Verizon advances as a <u>requirement</u> is simply its own opinion. (Grieco/Ball Rebuttal, 8/17, at 23-24).</p> <p>Verizon is proposing to change the historical method of determining the jurisdiction of traffic based on the NPA-NXXs of the calling and called parties. Verizon's proposal is a departure even from its own method of determining jurisdiction. In Verizon's Long Distance Services Tariff, S.C.C. Va. No. 209, Section 2A, Part C (1) Verizon indicates as follows: "Rates for service between points are based on the airline mileage between <u>rate centers</u>" (Emphasis added). The applicable rate centers (and the associated distances) are determined not based on the physical location of the customer but rather based on the NPA-NXXs assigned to the called and calling parties. Verizon does not look at the street addresses (<u>i.e.</u>, physical location) of the customers involved in a particular call, they look at the NPA-NXXs, identify the rate centers to which the calling and called NPA-NXXs are associated, and, if those rate centers are not within the local calling area of each other, they calculate airline mileage based on the V&H coordinates associated with the rate centers.</p>		

KEY WHERE DISTINCTION AMONG PETITIONERS IS NECESSARY: **WorldCom** (bold); Cox (underline text); *AT&T* (italic).

Issue No.	Statement of Issue	Petitioners' Proposed Contract Language	Petitioners' Rationale	Verizon's Proposed Contract Language	Verizon Rationale
			<p>(Grieco/Ball Rebuttal, 8/17, at 28). It is exactly this comparison of NPA-NXXs that allows Verizon to treat its own FX traffic as local. If Verizon were making its jurisdictional determination based on the physical location of the calling and called parties, it would be having to segregate its own FX traffic from all of its toll traffic in order to not bill toll charges. This is clearly not Verizon's practice. In fact, WorldCom believes that in the instance of calls originated from WorldCom end users to Verizon assigned FX numbers, such calls are not only treated by WorldCom as local, but Verizon bills WorldCom for reciprocal compensation for the transport and termination associated with such FX calls.(Grieco/Ball Rebuttal, 8/17, at 28-29).</p> <p>WorldCom's proposal ensures that the historical method of determining jurisdiction remains consistent among all parties. Verizon's proposal establishes a new, unique method for its CLEC competitors while allowing Verizon to continue with the standard methodology. Such unequal treatment should not be allowed. (Grieco/Ball Rebuttal, 8/17, at 29).</p> <p>Adoption of Verizon's position effectively would prohibit CLECs from offering FX service in competition with Verizon. This proposal is anti-competitive, limits choices available to consumers, and is inconsistent with the notion of parity. The benefits of competition to provide FX service would be eliminated. These negative consequences would take place because adoption of Verizon's position would raise the CLECs cost of providing a competitive service to a level that would effectively eliminate the CLEC's ability to offer a competing FX service.</p>		

KEY WHERE DISTINCTION AMONG PETITIONERS IS NECESSARY: WorldCom (bold); Cox (underline text); AT&T (italic).

Issue No.	Statement of Issue	Petitioners' Proposed Contract Language	Petitioners' Rationale	Verizon's Proposed Contract Language	Verizon Rationale
			<p>If Verizon were permitted to characterize WorldCom's FX service as toll traffic and to apply switched access charges, such above-cost pricing ultimately would make the offering of competitive alternatives by CLECs infeasible. This would limit Verizon's end users to Verizon's FX service. (Grieco/Ball Direct, 7/31, at 54-55).</p> <p>The California Commission has recognized the anti-competitive effects of applying access charges to a CLEC's FX service: The rating of a call, therefore, should be consistently determined based upon the designated NXX prefix. Abandoning the linkage between NXX prefix and rate center designation could undermine the ability of customers to discern whether a given NXX prefix will result in toll charges or not. Likewise, the service expectations of the called party (i.e., ISPs) would be undermined by imposing toll charges on such calls since customers of the ISPs would be precluded from reaching them through a local call. <i>Order Instituting Rulemaking on the Commission's Own Motion Into Competition for Local Exchange Service</i>, Rulemaking 95-04-043 at 26 (California PUC, Sept. 2, 1999) ("California Order").</p> <p>As the California Commission recognized, the retail offering of FX service and its associated rating (as a local call) based on the rate centers associated with the assigned NXXs must be applied to FX offerings from CLECs. Failure to do so distorts the way in which a CLEC can make a competitive FX offering available and, as described above, would in fact eliminate competition for this increasingly important service. (Grieco/Ball Direct, 7/31, at 55).</p> <p>For CLECs to be able to offer a competitive alternative to the Verizon FX service offerings, the</p>		

KEY WHERE DISTINCTION AMONG PETITIONERS IS NECESSARY: WorldCom (bold); Cox (underline text); AT&T (italic).

Issue No.	Statement of Issue	Petitioners' Proposed Contract Language	Petitioners' Rationale	Verizon's Proposed Contract Language	Verizon Rationale
			<p>traffic associated with FX service must be classified as "local" just as Verizon classifies its own FX traffic as local. Moreover, to the extent that Verizon proposes this classification to avoid so-called "arbitrage" opportunities relating to ISP-bound traffic, while we do not agree, that issue is now moot, given the FCC's recent Order regarding ISP-bound traffic. (Id. At 55-56).</p> <p>Standard industry practice is that FX traffic is local. As indicated above relative to Verizon's treatment of its own FX traffic, whether a call is local or not depends on the NPA/NXX dialed, not the physical location of the customer. Jurisdiction of traffic is properly determined by comparing the rate centers associated with the originating and terminating NPA/NXXs for any given call, not the physical location of the end-users. Comparison of the rate centers associated with the calling and called NPA/NXXs is consistent with how the jurisdiction of traffic and the applicability of toll charges are determined within the industry today. (Id. At 56).</p> <p>Indeed, not a single state has implemented a different method of distinguishing between local and toll traffic. All traffic continues to be put through a process that compares the NPA-NXX of the calling party to the NPA-NXX of the called party. If this comparison identifies the call as toll it is treated as toll. If the comparison identifies the call as local, it is treated as local. Every carrier in the country, including Verizon, adheres to this standard procedure. (Grieco/Ball Rebuttal, 8/17, at 24-25).</p> <p>The Commission has never ruled that the physical locations of the calling and called parties are the test as to what determines whether a call is local or toll.</p>		

KEY WHERE DISTINCTION AMONG PETITIONERS IS NECESSARY: **WorldCom** (bold); Cox (underline text); *AT&T* (italic).

Issue No.	Statement of Issue	Petitioners' Proposed Contract Language	Petitioners' Rationale	Verizon's Proposed Contract Language	Verizon Rationale
			<p>It has left that determination to the states. The Commission, at paragraph 1035 of the Local Competition Order states that "state commissions have the authority to determine what geographic areas should be considered 'local areas' for the purpose of applying reciprocal compensation obligations under section 251(b)(5), consistent with the state commissions' historical practice of defining local service areas for wireline LECs." (Grieco/Ball Rebuttal at 27).</p> <p>Verizon's FX service is categorized as local exchange service by the Virginia Commission. While the Virginia Commission has not addressed this issue in the context of an arbitration or generic proceeding, it has approved the Verizon FX service offering which is found in the Verizon Virginia, Inc. Local Exchange Services Tariff, S.C.C. VA. No. 202, at Section 4.a. Here Verizon defines its own FX service as "exchange service furnished from one exchange to a location in another exchange..." Verizon's FX service is not found in Verizon's access or long distance tariffs.</p> <p>Accordingly, with regard to FX service in Virginia, the Commission has approved Verizon's offering and provisioning of that service as local service. (Grieco/Ball Rebuttal, 8/17, at 27).</p> <p>Contrary to Verizon's statement that "To date, no state has agreed with the CLEC's position," many states have done just that.</p> <p>As previously noted, the California PUC, in <u>Order Instituting Rulemaking on the Commission's Own Motion Into Competition for Local Exchange Service</u>, Rulemaking 95-04-043 (Decision 99-09-029, September 2, 1999), has addressed this issue and found in favor of the CLEC's position as follows:</p>		

KEY WHERE DISTINCTION AMONG PETITIONERS IS NECESSARY: WorldCom (bold); Cox (underline text); AT&T (italic).

Issue No.	Statement of Issue	Petitioners' Proposed Contract Language	Petitioners' Rationale	Verizon's Proposed Contract Language	Verizon Rationale
			<p>Carriers should not be prohibited from designating different rating and routing points for call destinations since such a prohibition could undermine the incentives for carriers to develop innovative service alternatives in the most economically and technologically efficient manner.</p> <p>* * * *</p> <p>As discussed below, we conclude that the rating of calls as toll or local should be based upon the designated rate center of the NXX prefix of the calling and called parties' numbers. Even if the called party may be physically located in a different exchange from where the call is rated, the relevant rating point is the rate center of the NXX prefix."</p> <p>* * * *</p> <p>For purposes of considering the issue of call rating, it is not necessary to deliberate at length over whether Pac-West's service conforms to some particular definition of 'foreign exchange service' based upon specific provisioning arrangements. Although the Pac West form of service differs from certain other forms of foreign exchange service in how it is provisioned, the ultimate end-user expectation remains the same, namely to achieve a local presence within an exchange other than where the customer resides. From the end-use customer's perspective, Pac-West's service is a competitive alternative to other forms of foreign exchange service."</p> <p>The Kentucky Commission, in Case No. 2000-404, dated March 14, 2001, an arbitration decision regarding BellSouth and Level 3, has similarly found in favor of the CLEC as follows:</p> <p>"Both utilities offer a local telephone number to a person residing outside the local calling area. BellSouth's service is called foreign exchange ("FX") service and Level 3's service is called virtual NXX</p>		

KEY WHERE DISTINCTION AMONG PETITIONERS IS NECESSARY: WorldCom (bold); Cox (underline text); AT&T (italic).

Issue No.	Statement of Issue	Petitioners' Proposed Contract Language	Petitioners' Rationale	Verizon's Proposed Contract Language	Verizon Rationale
			<p>service. The traffic in question is dialed as a local call by the calling party. BellSouth agrees that it rates such foreign exchange traffic as local traffic for retail purposes. These calls are billed to customers as local traffic for retail purposes. These calls are billed to customers as local traffic. If they were treated differently here, BellSouth would be required to track all phone numbers that are foreign exchange or virtual NXX type service and remove these from what would otherwise be considered local calls for which reciprocal compensation is due. This practice would be unreasonable given the historical treatment of foreign exchange traffic as local traffic.</p> <p>Accordingly, the Commission finds that foreign exchange and virtual NXX services should be considered local traffic when the customer is physically located within the same LATA as the calling area with which the telephone number is associated."</p> <p>The Michigan Commission, in its response to Ameritech Michigan's request to, among other things, exempt foreign exchange service from payment of reciprocal compensation (Case No. U-12696, January 23, 2001), also found in favor of the CLEC position as follows:</p> <p>"The Commission rejects the proposal to reclassify FX calls as non-local for reciprocal compensation purposes. Ameritech Michigan has not explained whether, or how, the means of routing a call placed by one LEC's customer to another LEC's point of interconnection affects the costs that the second LEC necessarily incurs to terminate the call. As a matter of historical convention, the routing of that call, i.e., whether or not it crosses exchange boundaries, has not been equated with its rating, i.e., whether local or</p>		

KEY WHERE DISTINCTION AMONG PETITIONERS IS NECESSARY: **WorldCom** (bold); Cox (underline text); *AT&T* (italic).

Issue No.	Statement of Issue	Petitioners' Proposed Contract Language	Petitioners' Rationale	Verizon's Proposed Contract Language	Verizon Rationale
			<p>toll. Moreover, the discretion that CLECs exercise in designing their local calling areas is a competitive innovation that enables them to provide valuable alternatives to an ILEC's traditional service. The Commission finds no reason to change these standards, particularly if the end result would be an unnecessary restriction on the services that customers want and need. Moreover, the application does not address how the carriers would make the necessary changes to their billing systems or whether the changes would be technically feasible at an affordable cost for both Ameritech Michigan and the CLECs."</p> <p>While the Verizon witness cites a North Carolina decision in a BellSouth / AT&T arbitration, that decision appears to deal with transport of traffic to the POI generally, rather than in the context of FX traffic specifically. Verizon fails to mention the North Carolina decision in the BellSouth / MCI metro arbitration (Docket No. P-474, Sub 10) which addresses the provision of FX service. Again, finding in favor of the MCI metro position, the Commission stated:</p> <p>"The Commission notes that NPA/NXX codes were developed to rate calls and, therefore, MCI's assertion that whether a call is local or not depends on the NPA/NXX dialed, <u>not</u> the physical location of the customer, is reasonable and appropriate."</p> <p>In sum, there are many state commissions that have supported the position being advanced by WorldCom in this proceeding to the benefit of the competitive markets in their respective states. The Commission's decision in this proceeding should convey those same benefits to the state of Virginia. (Grieco/Ball Rebuttal, 8/17, at 33-36).</p>		

KEY WHERE DISTINCTION AMONG PETITIONERS IS NECESSARY: WorldCom (bold); Cox (underline text); AT&T (italic).

Issue No.	Statement of Issue	Petitioners' Proposed Contract Language	Petitioners' Rationale	Verizon's Proposed Contract Language	Verizon Rationale
			<p>Reciprocal Compensation should apply to foreign exchange traffic. As discussed above, this traffic is appropriately classified as local. Therefore, reciprocal compensation should be applicable. This is consistent with the purpose of reciprocal compensation, to compensate the terminating carrier for the costs associated with the termination of local traffic that originates on another carrier's network. (Grieco/Ball Direct, 7/31, at 56-57).</p> <p>The Michigan Public Service Commission in its Order on the application of reciprocal compensation to foreign exchange service made this finding:</p> <p>"The Commission rejects the proposal to reclassify FX calls as non-local for reciprocal compensation purposes. Ameritech Michigan has not explained whether, or how, the means of routing a call placed by one LEC's customer to another LEC's point of interconnection affects the costs that the second LEC necessarily incurs to terminate the call."</p> <p><i>In re: Application of Ameritech Michigan to revise its reciprocal compensation rates and rate structure and to exempt foreign exchange service from payment of reciprocal compensation</i>, Case No. U-12696, Opinion and Order at 10 (Jan. 23, 2001).</p> <p>Just as the method for determining the jurisdiction of FX traffic must be applied equally and consistently between ILECs and CLECs, so too must the obligation remain with the originating carrier to compensate the terminating Carrier for the termination of FX traffic.(Id. At 57).</p> <p>It is also important to note that a CLEC's offering of FX service is consistent with the Commission's rules regarding points of interconnection and an</p>		

KEY WHERE DISTINCTION AMONG PETITIONERS IS NECESSARY: **WorldCom** (bold); Cox (underline text); *AT&T* (italic).

Issue No.	Statement of Issue	Petitioners' Proposed Contract Language	Petitioners' Rationale	Verizon's Proposed Contract Language	Verizon Rationale
			<p>originating carrier's responsibility for transport of its traffic. As discussed in Issue I-1, the FCC has made clear that a CLEC is allowed to select the point of interconnection and may establish one or more such POIs in a single LATA. Additionally, each carrier is responsible for delivering local traffic to the designated POI(s). A CLEC's offering of FX service does not place any additional burdens on the ILEC. The costs to the ILEC for transporting traffic to the POI are the same whether or not the call is an FX call. The CLEC's FX offerings do not require the ILEC to perform any additional functions or meet any additional obligations other than those called for in the FCC's rules with regard to POI and transport requirements. (Id. At 57).</p> <p>Contrary to Verizon's assertions, a CLECs offering of FX service does not force Verizon to bear the costs of transporting the traffic to the CLEC switches.</p> <p>Verizon's responsibility is to deliver traffic originating on its network to the point of interconnection (POI) with the CLEC network, not with the CLEC's switch. A CLEC must establish at least one POI per LATA, regardless of where the CLEC's switch is located. With FX service, Verizon's responsibility is no different, and does not burden Verizon with any additional costs than are involved with the delivery of any other local traffic to the POI(s). Verizon also wrongly portrays its network as the only one involved in providing transport for FX traffic. (Grieco/Ball Rebuttal, 8/17, at 29).</p> <p>The WorldCom local network in Virginia is served by two switches. One is located in Washington, D.C. and the other in Reston, VA. WorldCom has established two POIs in Virginia to which Verizon</p>		

KEY WHERE DISTINCTION AMONG PETITIONERS IS NECESSARY: **WorldCom** (bold); Cox (underline text); *AT&T* (italic).

Issue No.	Statement of Issue	Petitioners' Proposed Contract Language	Petitioners' Rationale	Verizon's Proposed Contract Language	Verizon Rationale
			<p>delivers traffic destined for the WorldCom local switches. One POI is located in Arlington, Virginia, and the other in Winchester, Virginia. The switch in Washington, D.C. is interconnected with both of these POIs, and the Reston switch is interconnected with the Arlington POI.(Grieco/Ball Rebuttal, 8/17, at 29-30).</p> <p>Take as an example, a customer located in the same rate center as the Washington, D.C. switch that wants a foreign presence in the Leesburg rate center. In this instance WorldCom would provide the customer a telephone number from an NPA-NXX that is assigned to the Leesburg rate center. Once established, a call placed by a Verizon customer located in the Leesburg rate center to the FX telephone number would be routed by Verizon to the Winchester POI. The distance, based on the aforementioned V & H coordinates, from the Leesburg rate center to the Winchester POI would be approximately 36 miles. Once Verizon delivers the call to the Winchester POI, its network responsibility is over and the call is then routed onto the WorldCom transport network. The distance from the Winchester POI to the Washington, D.C. switch is approximately 69 miles. WorldCom is transporting this call almost twice the distance as Verizon. It should also be noted that if this were not an FX call and the called party was actually located in the Leesburg rate center, Verizon would deliver that call to the same Winchester POI and incur the same transport costs. Verizon has not supported its assertion that it is incurring excessive transport costs and, as this example makes clear, there is no such "additional" burden. (Grieco/Ball Rebuttal, 8/17, at 30).</p> <p>Based on July 2001 traffic and the current points of</p>		

KEY WHERE DISTINCTION AMONG PETITIONERS IS NECESSARY: **WorldCom** (bold); Cox (underline text); *AT&T* (italic).

Issue No.	Statement of Issue	Petitioners' Proposed Contract Language	Petitioners' Rationale	Verizon's Proposed Contract Language	Verizon Rationale
			<p>interconnection that have been established between the Verizon and WorldCom networks for exchange of Virginia local traffic, on average Verizon is transporting traffic approximately 10 miles. This was calculated based on the V&H coordinates associated with each of the rate centers from which Verizon customers originate local calls to WorldCom customers and the V&H coordinates of the two points of interconnection in Virginia. (Grieco/Ball Rebuttal, 8/17, at 30-31).</p> <p>Because WorldCom's proposal is to <u>maintain</u> the current method of determining jurisdiction by comparison of the NPA-NXXs associated with the call, the average transport distance being experienced by Verizon will not change. Verizon's unsubstantiated claim of a tremendous "transport burden" entirely lacks merit. (Grieco/Ball Rebuttal, 8/17, at 31).</p> <p>FX calls should also be subject to reciprocal compensation because they are not subject to access charges. As the Commission's recent ISP Order made clear, Section 251(b)(5) literally requires reciprocal compensation for the transport and termination of all telecommunications, not just local traffic. <u>See</u> 47 U.S.C. § 251(b)(5). In the ISP Remand Order, the Commission ruled that 251(g) excluded certain traffic from the reach of (b)(5). FX traffic was <u>not</u> excluded, and so plainly is covered by reciprocal compensation. (Grieco/Ball Direct, 7/31, at 58).</p> <p>The commission has identified the differences in circumstances when reciprocal compensation applies and when access charges would apply.</p> <p>At paragraph 1034 of the Local Competition Order</p>		

KEY WHERE DISTINCTION AMONG PETITIONERS IS NECESSARY: WorldCom (bold); Cox (underline text); AT&T (italic).

Issue No.	Statement of Issue	Petitioners' Proposed Contract Language	Petitioners' Rationale	Verizon's Proposed Contract Language	Verizon Rationale
			<p>the Commission stated as follows:</p> <p>“Access charges were developed to address a situation in which three carriers – typically, the originating LEC, the IXC, and the terminating LEC – collaborate to complete a long-distance call. As a general matter, in the access charge regime, the long-distance caller pays long-distance charges to the IXC, and the IXC must pay both LECs for originating and terminating access service. By contrast, reciprocal compensation for transport and termination of calls is intended for a situation in which two carriers collaborate to complete a local call. In this case, the local caller pays charges to the originating carrier, and the originating carrier must compensate the terminating carrier for completing the call.”</p> <p>The FX service of such concern to Verizon is clearly a circumstance where two carriers are collaborating to complete a local call and not where three carriers, two LECs and an IXC, are collaborating to complete a long-distance call. As Verizon describes, FX traffic involves calls originating on the local network of one LEC and terminating on the local network of another LEC. There is no IXC involved. (Grieco/Ball Rebuttal, 8/17, at 25).</p> <p>The definitions of local, or exchange service, and toll service found in Title 47 of USC provide further support that FX traffic is not toll traffic.</p> <p>47 U.S.C. § 153 (47) defines telephone exchange services as follows:</p> <p>The term “telephone exchange service” means (A) service within a telephone exchange, or within a connected system of telephone exchanges within the same exchange area operated to furnish to</p>		

KEY WHERE DISTINCTION AMONG PETITIONERS IS NECESSARY: **WorldCom** (bold); Cox (underline text); *AT&T* (italic).

Issue No.	Statement of Issue	Petitioners' Proposed Contract Language	Petitioners' Rationale	Verizon's Proposed Contract Language	Verizon Rationale
			<p>subscribers intercommunicating service of the character ordinarily furnished by a single exchange, and which is covered by the exchange service charge, or (B) comparable service provided through a system of switches, transmission equipment, or other facilities (or combination thereof) by which a subscriber can originate and terminate a telecommunications service."</p> <p>On the other hand toll service, at 47 U.S.C. § 153 (48) is defined as follows:</p> <p>The term "telephone toll service" means telephone service between stations in different exchange areas for which there is made a separate charge not included in contracts with subscribers for exchange service.</p> <p>Under these definitions FX traffic cannot be placed in the jurisdiction of toll service. The Verizon local service subscriber placing a call to a Verizon assigned FX number does not incur a separate charge beyond the charges for the local exchange service. In fact, consistent with the definition of telephone exchange service, the ability to originate calls to FX numbers is included in the local exchange service charge. Verizon appears intent on punishing its own end users for calling a subscriber to a <i>competitive</i> FX offering based on its incorrect assertion that this is toll traffic. At page 8 of the testimony Verizon complains that it is "unable to bill these toll charges to the originating customer...." Again, this would not be Verizon's intention if the originating customer were calling a subscriber to <u>Verizon's</u> FX offering. (Grieco/Ball Rebuttal, 8/17, at 26-27).</p> <p>Contrary to Verizon's claims, it does not lose toll</p>		

KEY WHERE DISTINCTION AMONG PETITIONERS IS NECESSARY: WorldCom (bold); Cox (underline text); AT&T (italic).

Issue No.	Statement of Issue	Petitioners' Proposed Contract Language	Petitioners' Rationale	Verizon's Proposed Contract Language	Verizon Rationale
			<p>revenue by not being able to bill its originating customers for calls to FX numbers. The very point of this service is to provide end users a <u>local</u> calling number for a particular business. Verizon incorrectly assumes that this same traffic would exist even if it required a toll call. But if the originating caller is looking to call a local number for the service he seeks, it is highly unlikely that he would instead dial a toll number (which would allow Verizon to bill its toll charges). Far more likely, the customer would simply find a vendor with a local number and place that call instead. Verizon is not losing toll revenues. (Grieco/Ball Rebuttal, 8/17, at 31).</p> <p>Verizon's alleged concern with the use of numbering resources in conjunction with FX service is disingenuous. Verizon, consistent with its desire to eliminate competition with its own FX service, suggests that because CLECs utilize NPA-NXX assignments in the provision of FX service, CLECs should be prohibited from making such a competitive offering available. Verizon ignores that its own use of numbering resources for the provision of FX service raises the same concerns. (Grieco/Ball Rebuttal, 8/17, at 31-32).</p> <p>Obviously, numbering resources must be conserved and utilized efficiently. Implementation of conservation measures for numbers and efficient management practices must be adopted by all parties. However, elimination of a competitive offering is an unacceptable and counter productive method of conserving numbers. Taken to its logical conclusion, the best way to conserve numbers would be to prohibit ALL local competition. But the Telecommunications Act of 1996 requires Verizon to make available to competitors the same capabilities that it makes use of itself. (Grieco/Ball Rebuttal,</p>		

KEY WHERE DISTINCTION AMONG PETITIONERS IS NECESSARY: WorldCom (bold); Cox (underline text); AT&T (italic).

Issue No.	Statement of Issue	Petitioners' Proposed Contract Language	Petitioners' Rationale	Verizon's Proposed Contract Language	Verizon Rationale
			<p>8/17, at 31-32).</p> <p>The Maine PUC order cited by Verizon does not provide results that should be copied by this Commission.</p> <p>The Maine Commission identified a pressing problem with number exhaust in the state of Maine. The decision it reached was driven by that concern, at the expense of the competitive market in Maine. While determining that the FX service being offered by Brooks Fiber was not local, the Commission realized that competition was important to allow customers to reach their Internet Service Providers. Having a statutory obligation to ensure that end users across the state of Maine had affordable access to the Internet, the Maine Commission directed Verizon to create a service offering for ISPs that would replace the service being offered by Brooks.</p> <p>As of this date (some two and a half years since the investigation was opened) Brooks, with the authority of the Maine Commission, continues to provide its FX service to its existing customers on a grandfathered basis during the pendency of Verizon's continuing efforts to develop and implement an acceptable substitute service.</p> <p>The impact on the competitive market is best expressed by one of the Brooks FX customers in its recent filing with the Maine Commission for an investigation into Verizon's implementation of its substitute service. In its filing, Great Works Internet concludes:</p> <p>"GWI is concerned that the cost of this service will be much more costly than promised and that GWI will not be able to maintain its commitment to</p>		

KEY WHERE DISTINCTION AMONG PETITIONERS IS NECESSARY: **WorldCom** (bold); Cox (underline text); *AT&T* (italic).

Issue No.	Statement of Issue	Petitioners' Proposed Contract Language	Petitioners' Rationale	Verizon's Proposed Contract Language	Verizon Rationale
			<p>quality, which it has long enjoyed while using Brooks for its dialup infrastructure. And most troublesome of all, is the fact that GWI was forced into a position where it has only one choice for its dialup infrastructure. By action of the MPUC under 98-758, there is no longer any competition for VZ-ME in the ISP service arena. GWI is quite confident that VZ-ME's commitment to quality and customer service will further erode."</p> <p>The negative impacts on the competitive market associated with Verizon's proposal are accurately portrayed by GWI. The Maine decision, instead of supporting Verizon's position, is illustrative of how a refusal to permit competitive FX services eliminates competition in the local service market. (Grieco/Ball Rebuttal, 8/17, at 32-33).</p> <p>In sum, the Commission should adopt WorldCom's language with regard to assigning NXXs within the LATA in a manner that provides for rating points different from routing points and should conclude that the appropriate method for determining the jurisdiction of this traffic is to compare the rate centers associated with the calling and called NXXs. This resolution will permit WorldCom to offer competitive FX service to their customers on non-discriminatory terms.</p> <p>Verizon should be required to pay reciprocal compensation to WorldCom for transport and termination of this traffic.</p> <p>Verizon's proposed resolution of this matter, on the other hand, would not allow CLECs to assign NXXs in such a manner as to provide <u>local</u> FX service. Verizon refuses to recognize this as local traffic and insists on applying originating access charges as well as refusing to pay reciprocal compensation to WorldCom. Verizon proposes to treat CLECs FX</p>		

KEY WHERE DISTINCTION AMONG PETITIONERS IS NECESSARY: **WorldCom** (bold); Cox (underline text); *AT&T* (italic).

Issue No.	Statement of Issue	Petitioners' Proposed Contract Language	Petitioners' Rationale	Verizon's Proposed Contract Language	Verizon Rationale
			<p>service differently than Verizon treats its own retail FX service. The Commission should reject this discrimination. (Grieco/Ball Rebuttal, 8/17, at 37).</p> <p><u>POSITION:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Verizon proposes that the parties use an infeasible method i.e., a comparison would be made between the originating and terminating "points" of the call, to determine whether a given call exchanged between the parties is local or toll. Cox Petition at 16. • Cox proposes to differentiate between local and toll traffic by comparing the originating and terminating NXX codes. Cox Petition at 16; Collins Direct Testimony at 24. • Cox's approach is the only means currently available for determining the jurisdiction of calls for billing purposes. It accordingly is standard practice throughout the telecommunications industry. Cox Petition at 16; Collins Direct Testimony at 24; Collins Rebuttal Testimony at 34. • Verizon's own billing systems are programmed to compare the originating and terminating NPA-NXXs on a call in order to determine its proper jurisdiction. Cox Petition at 16; Collins Rebuttal Testimony at 32, 33-34. • Cox is unaware of any billing systems in use today that could make Verizon's proposed 'point' comparison. Cox Petition at 16; Collins Direct Testimony at 24. • Verizon's proposal would require parties to make call-by-call determinations of "actual" origination and termination points and there is no current technology 		

KEY WHERE DISTINCTION AMONG PETITIONERS IS NECESSARY: **WorldCom** (bold); Cox (underline text); *AT&T* (italic).

Issue No.	Statement of Issue	Petitioners' Proposed Contract Language	Petitioners' Rationale	Verizon's Proposed Contract Language	Verizon Rationale
			<p>that would permit carriers to do so. <u>Collins Direct Testimony at 24-25.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Verizon's proposal would treat much ISP-bound traffic as toll traffic, contrary to the requirements of the <i>ISP-Bound Traffic Order</i>. Collins Direct Testimony at 24.</u> • <u>Verizon offers a variety of services that do not match the geographic location of the called party with the assigned location of the party's NXX code, and wireless service also frequently involves such mismatches. Moreover, nothing prevents Verizon from offering its own "virtual FX" service. Collins Rebuttal Testimony at 32, 34-35.</u> • <u>Verizon's proposal would force carriers and customers to waste resources to comply with a regulatory fiction. Collins Rebuttal Testimony at 35.</u> • <u>Cox's practices flow from its efficient network design. Collins Rebuttal Testimony at 36.</u> • <u>Verizon does not lose any revenue it reasonably could expect to collect as a result of Cox's practices, and it incurs similar costs for FX calls routed on its network without imposing toll charges on the parties making those calls. Collins Rebuttal Testimony at 36-37.</u> • <u>Virginia case law holds that the proper method of determining whether a call is local is by reference to the telephone number. Cox Petition, Exhibit 6 at 10.</u> • <u>Verizon has other remedies available to it under state law if it believes calls are being rated improperly. Collins Direct Testimony at 25; Collins Rebuttal</u> 		

KEY WHERE DISTINCTION AMONG PETITIONERS IS NECESSARY: **WorldCom** (bold); Cox (underline text); *AT&T* (italic).